UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/624,403	07/21/2003	Kevin E. Fu	200311171-1	6808	
	7590 04/16/200 CKARD COMPANY	9	EXAM	INER	
	00, 3404 E. HARMON AL PROPERTY ADM				
	AL PROPERTY ADM IS, CO 80527-2400	IINISTKATION	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2431		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/16/2009	ELECTRONIC	

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM ipa.mail@hp.com jessica.l.fusek@hp.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/624,403	FU ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SHIN-HON CHEN	2431	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address -	-
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THIS COMMUNICA	ATION.  ly be timely filed  IS from the mailing date of this communication  NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ Th 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matte	•	s is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest signal of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest signal of the above claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and claim(s) are subject to restriction and claim(s) are subjected to by the Examination of the drawing(s) filed on 21 July 2003 is/are: a	rawn from consideration.  /or election requirement.  ner.	d to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	ection is required if the drawing(s	is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docume 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docume 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the prapplication from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Apiority documents have been re eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/	nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date rmal Patent Application	

Application/Control Number: 10/624,403 Page 2

Art Unit: 2431

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-21 have been examined.

### **Double Patenting**

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-21 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 7,313,238. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both applications disclose a method of determining limited number of previous keys based on key catalyst using backward key rotation.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Application/Control Number: 10/624,403

Art Unit: 2431

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Page 3

Claims 1-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. While the claims recite a series of steps or acts to be performed, a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to particular machine, or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing. See page 10 of In Re Bilski 88 USPQ2d 1385. The instant claims are neither positively tied to a particular machine that accomplishes the claimed method steps nor transform underlying subject matter, and therefore do not qualify as a statutory process. The key generation method including steps of providing information and generating keys using said information is broad enough that the claim could be completely performed mentally, verbally or without a machine nor is any transformation apparent.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 6. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 7. As per claims 1-7, claim 1 discloses multiple keys and later discloses "providing said key" without referring specifically to one of the key recited in earlier steps. Furthermore, it appears that the series of keys is generated from information provided, yet the provided

Application/Control Number: 10/624,403 Page 4

Art Unit: 2431

information is derived from the series of keys. The steps do not clearly convey the method involved. .

- 8. As per claim 8-14, claim 8 discloses providing to a user a key rotation element and a key, wherein later versions of the key rotation element are determinable by the user but previous versions of the key rotation element are not determinable by said user. The claim later discloses determining a version of the key from (Ki Ki+n+1) by applying a version of the key rotation element to a version of the key from (Ki+1 Ki+n). The method is not clear as to how the previous versions of the key rotation element are not determinable by said user and how the series of keys affect each other during key generation.
- 9. As per claim 15-21, claim 15 discloses generating an initial key rotation exponent, wherein said initial key rotation exponent allows previous versions of file keys to be determined back until a predetermined version of the file key, but no file key further back. The claim is indefinite where it recites "but no file key further back" because it does not indicate the relative degree that the file key is generated.

### Response to Arguments

10. In view of the Supplemental Appeal Brief filed on 12/18/08, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth above.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

Application/Control Number: 10/624,403

Art Unit: 2431

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37

CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an

appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee

can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have

been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between

the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing

below:

/Ayaz R. Sheikh/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2431

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Nakashima et al. U.S. Pat. No. 7587247 discloses system for decrypting encrypted

software using backward decryption.

Graunke et al. U.S. Pat. No. 7068786 discloses dual use block/stream cipher.

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 10/624,403 Page 6

Art Unit: 2431

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHIN-HON CHEN whose telephone number is (571)272-3789.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shin-Hon Chen Examiner Art Unit 2431

/Shin-Hon Chen/ Examiner, Art Unit 2431